

## REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending.

Claims 1-27 stand rejected.

Claims 8 and 21 have been amended to correct a typographical error.

### Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Specifically, claims 1-7, 9-20, and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,683 (Logan) in view of Cohen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,377,983 (Cohen). Claims 8 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Cohen, and further in view of Fogg et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,163,778 (Fogg). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

For the reasons below, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action dated July 28, 2003 (the "Office Action") has not satisfied a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1-27.

### The References Fail to Disclose All of the Claim Limitations

Logan and Cohen, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for operating a computer to display historical information about hyperlinks shown on web pages, including:

referencing the identified characteristics against a presentation table to derive enhanced presentation attributes appropriate to the hyperlink,

as required by independent claim 1, and as generally required by independent claims 14 and 27.

The Office Action states that Logan "teaches comparing content of the web page with item in a table to determine the appropriate associated presentation modifications

(col 2, ln 33 – 52).” (Office Action, p. 3). Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has mischaracterized Logan. The cited portion of Logan on which the Office Action relies teaches comparing text in a document with text in a table of predetermined text strings. If the comparison results in a match, the text is modified so as to suppress information to which access is not authorized. Thus, the table in Logan is referenced in order to determine whether or not document text is authorized for view. (see Logan, col. 2, ln 33 -52). In contrast, Applicants’ independent claims 1, 14, and 27 recite “referencing the identified characteristics against a presentation table *to derive enhanced presentation attributes appropriate to the hyperlink.*” As described in the Specification, identified characteristics are referenced against a presentation table to determine how to present the hyperlink to the user. Namely, *the presentation table maps between each possible data characteristic and a corresponding enhanced presentation attribute.* Some exemplary presentation attributes and their corresponding data characteristics include (1) text font such as italics to represent sites that download rapidly, (2) text color such as black to represent expired hyperlinks, (3) specialty characters such as an asterisk to represent sites that have been highly rated by the user, or (4) multimedia symbols selected by the user to represent the hyperlinked data. Ultimately, when the computer displays the downloaded web page, it presents each hyperlink with its enhanced presentation attributes. (see Specification, p. 4).

Accordingly, because Logan and Cohen fail to teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, all of the claim limitations, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been satisfied. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are allowable over Logan and Cohen and a notice of allowance to this effect is respectfully requested. Claims 2 – 13 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 15 – 26 depend from claim 14 and are allowable for at least this reason.

*Claims 2 – 3, and 15 - 16*

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 14, respectively, claims 2-3 and 15-16, are patentable over Cohen and Logan. The Office Action states that Cohen teaches an access group having one user and multiple users (see Office Action, p. 3). However, while the cited portion of Cohen makes mention of a first and second user, nowhere is there any mention of an access group, or specifically, a predefined access group having a single member, or having multiple members, where the database is accessible to all members, as recited in claims 2,15 and 3,16 respectively.

*Claims 4 and 17*

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 14, respectively, claims 4 and 17, are patentable over Cohen and Logan because Cohen and Logan fail to disclose prior to analyzing the hyperlink, selecting the database from multiple available databases, as recited in claims 4 and 17. As the Office Action recognizes, neither Cohen nor Logan teach or suggest this limitation. The Office Action states that Cohen does teach choosing from a set of access groups, however, clearly this does not teach or suggest Applicant's claim of selecting the database from multiple available databases.

*Claims 5 and 18*

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 14, respectively, claims 5 and 18, are patentable over Cohen and Logan because Cohen and Logan fail to disclose the operations of presenting each hyperlink with its derived enhanced presentation attributes including at least one of the following: displaying text, displaying graphics, generating sound, providing tactile output. The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include various types of output so as to enable users with disabilities to access the data. However, Applicants respectfully traverse, and request specific citation to a prior art reference.

*Claims 6, 9, 13 and 19, 22, 26*

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 14, respectively, claims 6, 9, 13 and 19, 22, 26 are patentable over Cohen and Logan. The Office Action states that it was known and typical in the art at the time of the invention for web pages and other software to output text and annotations, citing JP11039310. The Applicants respectfully traverse, and respectfully submit that the prior art has been mischaracterized.

*Claims 7 and 20*

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 14, respectively, claims 7 and 20, are patentable over Cohen and Logan because Cohen and Logan fail to disclose the predetermined user input additionally including depressing of one or more buttons on a computer mouse while the cursor is proximate the hyperlink. Although the Office Action cites to col. 2, ln 18-32 of Logan as teach this limitation, nowhere does this cited portion of Logan teach the depression of one or more buttons on a computer mouse, much less disclose that the predetermined user input additionally includes the depressing of one or more buttons on a computer mouse while the cursor is proximate the hyperlink, as recited in claims 5 and 16. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 16 are allowable over Cohen and Logan.

*Claims 10 and 23*

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 14, respectively, claims 10 and 23, are patentable over Cohen and Logan. The Office Action states that Cohen teaches saving information regarding a sequence of documents accessed by a user (see Office Action, p. 5). However, the cited portion of Cohen on which the Office Action relies teaches capturing a first user's activities, such as a document URL and how the document was accessed, and storing information in a log file. In contrast, Applicant's claims recite that responsive to the user selecting a hyperlink to download underlying data represented by the hyperlink, the computer downloading the underlying data represented by the hyperlink, and recording *predetermined characteristics of the underlying data in the database*. Thus, while Cohen may teach capturing the name of a document and how it was accessed, Cohen does not teach or suggest recording

predetermined characteristics about the underlying data, and recording that information in a database.

*Claims 11 and 24*

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 14, respectively, claims 11 and 24, are patentable over Cohen and Logan. The Office Action states that Cohen teaches a number of characteristics being saved, including if the page was arrived at via a selection of a stored bookmark. (see Office Action, p. 6). Cohen teaches capturing methods a first user uses to access a document, including whether the document was accessed by a bookmark. Cohen takes this captured information and makes it available to a second who then has the ability to view how a first user accessed a document. (see Cohen, col. 3, lines 25 – 45). Regarding this particular example, Cohen does not display whether or not the second user has bookmarked the data. In contrast, the Applicants' claims 11 and 24 recite that a number of characteristics of underlying data of a document are recorded responsive to each occasion on which a computer receives user selection of a hyperlink to download underlying data represented by the hyperlink, including whether *the user* has bookmarked the underlying data.

*Claims 8 and 21*

In addition to their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 14, respectively, claims 8 and 21, are patentable over Logan in view of Cohen and in further view of Fogg et al. The Office Action states that Fogg teaches acquiring rating information based on a user's attempted access of a hyperlink. (see Office Action, pp. 6-7). Applicants respectfully submit that Fogg teaches the calculation of a rating of a document based on the viability of the links to the document. Fogg does not teach or suggest soliciting the rating from the user. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 21 are allowable over Cohen, Logan, and Fogg.

### There is No Motivation or Suggestion to Combine

Notwithstanding the fact that the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been satisfied because there is no motivation or suggestion to modify the references or to combine the reference teachings, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.


Cohen teaches capturing documents that experts view, categorizing the documents, and allowing a user to view the categorized list. (see Cohen, Abstract). Logan teaches a system to control access to content that is displayed on display units, such as kiosks. (see Logan, Abstract). Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cohen and Logan in such a way that Cohen's determination of previously accessed hyperlinks would have allowed Logan to access a database to determine page characteristics.

First, Logan has in place a method for controlling access to documents and thus there is no motivation to look to Cohen. Additionally, using Cohen's determination of previously accessed hyperlinks to allow Logan to access a database to determine page characteristics goes against Logan since Logan uses a control file to determine which text, for example, to display on the kiosk screen. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to modify the references or to combine the reference teachings, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to the rejection of claims 1-27, and the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 – 27 are allowable.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the numbers provided below.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, Washington, D.C. 20231, on November 26, 2003.	
	<u>11/26/03</u>
Attorney for Applicants	Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Kennel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,562  
Phone: (520) 799-2582  
Facsimile: (520) 799-5551